



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/549,480

09/15/2005

Masahiro Yamakawa

4670-0110PUS1

8164

2292 7590 03/10/2010
BIRCH STEWART KOLASCH & BIRCH
PO BOX 747
FALLS CHURCH, VA 22040-0747

EXAMINER

REDDY, KARUNA P

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

1796

NOTIFICATION DATE

DELIVERY MODE

03/10/2010

ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

mailroom@bskb.com

Art Unit: 1796

Attachment to Advisory Action

1. Applicants' amendment filed 3/1/2010 has been fully considered; however, the amendment has not been entered given that it introduces new issues and new claims (claims 12-13) that would require further consideration and/or search.
2. With respect to new issue, claim 11 introduces the new limitation "monomer units (b) derived from acrylonitrile". This is in contrast to the earlier amended claim filed 8/25/2009, which recited "monomer units (b) derived from an α , β -ethylenically unsaturated nitrile compound". Therefore, present amendment would require further consideration and/or search.
3. In the interest of better enabling the applicants to assess the patentability of their claims, the following advisory is given:

It is noted that examples (example 1 and comparative example 1) in cited prior art of Yamamoto et al (US 2002/0034686 A1) referred to by the applicant do not represent closest prior art example used in the rejection set forth in paragraphs 3-4 of preceding office action mailed 11/4/2009. Example 1 of Yamamoto et al does not use component "c" required by the instant claims and taught in example 2 of Yamamoto. It is the examiner's position that comparison should be with that of the closest prior art (i.e. example 2 in Yamamoto et al).

/K. P. R./

Examiner, Art Unit 1796

Application/Control Number: 10/549,480

Page 3

Art Unit: 1796

/Vasu Jagannathan/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1796